

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. In the October 19, 2005 non-final office action, the Examiner:

A. Objected to claims 20

B. Rejected Claims 1-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Newman et al. (hereinafter "Newman") USP 5,313,615.

C. Rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,313,615 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,325,526 by Cameron et al. (hereinafter Cameron).

II. Applicants response to the examiner's final office action is provided below. Claims 20 has been amended to overcome the examiner's objection.

A. Claims 20 has been amended in light of the examiner's objection

Claims 20 has been amended pursuant to the examiner's objection to properly claim dependence to claim 17. The examiner is thanked for pointing out this informality.

B. The Rejection of Claims 1-13 and 15-18 in view of Newman is in Error

1. The Present Invention

In one of applicant's previous responses, claims 1, 9 and 17 were amended to make it clear that what was being claimed was a controller for executing block programs to control at least one device in a network. The controller is provided with a block execution engine which selectively executes block programs only

when the block execution engine determines there is a new input value. In this way the controller may be provided with a less powerful and/or expensive processor since fewer blocks have to be executed by the controller.

2. Newman

Newman generally relates to a simulator which provides method for ordering computer software procedures in an order in computing machine for modeling each of multiple blocks of a block diagram. Each block corresponds to a software feature for performing at least one function and has at least one input or at least one output.

3. Newman Does Not Disclose Only Executing Blocks in a Block Program that Receives a New Input Value which is Different from a Previous Input Value

As discussed in paragraph 1 above, Claims 1, 9 and 17 as currently presented require a controller that is capable of controlling at least one device in a control network. This is a fundamental difference from Newman, which discloses a simulator which by definition is not capable of actually controlling any devices in a network.

This is an issue the examiner has not directly addressed beyond a confusing statement regarding Newman that “the intended of use can be different.” Simply put, Newman does not disclose a controller capable of controlling at least one device, and so the rejection of independent claims 1, 9 and 17 should be withdrawn under 35 U.S.C 102(b) for this reason alone since Newman does not teach each and every limitation of claims 1, 9 and 17.

Secondly, Newman does not update blocks only when a change of input value has been determined. The examiner, in his previous office action, failed to point out where Newman discloses updating blocks only when a change of input value has been determined.

With respect to Figs 3A-3C of Newman and their corresponding description, the simulator may execute blocks even no change of input value has been detected. Newman does not selectively execute blocks only when an change of input value has been detected, but when there is a predetermined relation between any input in the fee-through list and in the input list for a block in a block diagram. For example, as shown in column 19, lines 32-38, procedure call for summer block 86 is followed by procedure call for the summer blocks 88 and 90, which is followed by procedure call for the sink block 68. These are blocks are all placed on the sequence list. As Fig. 3B clearly shows, 88 and 90 have the same input value, inputs 120. Accordingly, it is clear that Newman does not show the claimed invention which requires that function blocks are executed only when a change of input value is detected. The examiner is respectfully requested to directly address this argument.

With respect to claim 9, Newman also clearly fails to disclose setting a flag in block records when at least one input value changes and executing algorithms of said blocks in said block program having corresponding block records that have said flag set. It is noted that the examiner has again failed to address this comment from the previous response.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Newman fails to anticipate the invention in shown in independent claims 1,9 and 17. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the examiner's rejection of claims 1,9 and 17 be withdrawn.

4. Claims 2-8,10-13,15,16 and 18

Claims 2-8,10-13,15,16 and 18 also stand rejected as allegedly being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,313,615. Claims 2-8, 10-13,15,16 and 18 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claims 1,9 and 17. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as those set forth above in connection with claims 1, 9 and 17 it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 2-8,10-13,15,16 and 18 should be withdrawn.

Cameron Fails to Cure the Deficiencies of Newman

Claim 14 stands rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Newman in view of Cameron. Claim 14 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of claim 9. Like Newman, Cameron fails to disclose only executing blocks in a block program that receives a new input value with is different from a previous input value. Accordingly, for the same reason as set forth above in connection with claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicants have made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
SIEMENS CORPORATION

Dated: 1/11/06

By: 

Michael J. Wallace
Reg. No. 44,486

SIEMENS CORPORATION
CUSTOMER NO. 28524
Tel. 732-321 -3008
Fax. 732-321-3014